

**REMARKS**

The Examiner has objected to the title of the invention and has also objected to the specification. Applicants respectfully request that these objections to form be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) for not showing the distance between a contact portion of the external terminals and the external face as recited in the claims. Applicants respectfully disagree with the assertion that this distance is not shown. More particularly, this language is shown, for example, in Fig. 10 and is described, for example, on pg. 40, lines 13 – 25. Therefore, because the claimed subject matter is shown in the drawings, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claims 1 – 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. More particularly, the Examiner has asserted that there is no antecedent basis for the limitation “the direction” and that the meaning of the limitation “exposed to the direction” is unclear. Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite direction with proper antecedent basis.

The limitation “exposed to the direction” is discussed on, for example, pg. 9, lines 14 – 21. More particularly, this may refer to, for example, the case where the external terminals of the electronic component are protruding from the external terminal face, and the case where the external terminals of the electronic component are scarcely protruding from the external terminal face of the electronic component.

Therefore, because claim 1, as amended, recites definite subject matter, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 - 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

Claims 1 – 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention. More particularly, the Examiner has asserted that the claims fail to correspond to pg. 40, paragraph 3, lines 7 – 11 of the specification.

Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. Pg. 40, paragraph 3 of the specification discusses the thickness of a thin plate 163. Particularly, the thickness is adjusted to be thinner than a distance between the tip portion of the external terminal 22 and the external terminal face 23. This language is in no way inconsistent with the scope of the claims, particularly since claim 1 recites “equal to or less than a distance.”

Therefore, because claim 1 – 11 set forth the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 – 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

If the Examiner chooses to maintain this rejection, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner clarify the asserted inconsistencies between the scope of the claims and the specification.

Claims 1 – 7 and 9 – 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,439,897 to Ikeya. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 12 recite the novel embodiment disclosed, for example, on pgs. 38 – 40 in which an insert 16 comprising a supporting portion 163 for supporting an external terminal face 23 of an area array type electronic component 2 so that external terminals 22 of the area array type electronic component 2 are exposed to a direction of connection terminals 44 of a socket 40, wherein a thickness of the supporting portion 163 is approximately equal to or less than a distance between a contact portion of the external terminals 22 of the area array type electronic

component and the external terminal face 23 of the area array type electronic component 2, and the supporting portion is provided to be positioned between the external terminal face 23 of the area array type electronic component 2 and the connection terminal face 42 of the socket 40 when the external terminals 22 of the area array type electronic component and the connection terminals 44 of the socket 40 are connected.

Ikeya also discloses an apparatus for mounting electronic packages. This apparatus includes a socket 1 having a base 10 forming a recess. The apparatus also includes a support portion 13. However, Ikeya fails to disclose that a thickness of the supporting portion is approximately equal to or less than a distance between a contact portion of the external terminals of the area array type electronic component and the external terminal face of the area array type electronic component or that the supporting portion is provided to be positioned between the external terminal face of the area array type electronic component and the connection terminal face of the socket when the external terminals of the area array type electronic component and the connection terminals of the socket are connected.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1 and 12, as well as dependent claims 2 – 7 and 9 – 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn.


Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeya. Claim 8 depends from claim 1. Therefore, claim 8 should be in condition for allowance for the above-mentioned reasons with respect to claim 1.

Applicant has filed a Petition for Revival under 37 C.F.R. 1.137(b) as well as a Request for Refund concurrently with this submission.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A timely notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If questions relating to patentability remain, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

If there are any problems with the payment of fees, please charge any underpayments and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kerry S. Culpepper", written over a horizontal line.

Kerry S. Culpepper  
Reg. No. 45,672

Posz Law Group, PLC  
12040 South Lakes Drive, Suite 101  
Reston, VA 20191  
Phone 703-707-9110  
Fax 703-707-9112  
Customer No. 23400